

REMARKS

I. Introduction

Claims 10 to 18 are pending in the present application. In view of the foregoing amendments and the following remarks, it is respectfully submitted that all of the presently pending claims are allowable, and reconsideration is respectfully requested.

Applicant notes with appreciation the acknowledgment of the claim for foreign priority and the acknowledgment that all copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received.

Applicant thanks the Examiner for considering the previously filed Information Disclosure Statement, PTO-1449 paper and cited references.

II. Allowable Subject Matter

Applicant notes with appreciate the indication of allowable subject matter included in claims 11, 13 to 16, and 18. In this regard, the Examiner will note that each of claims 11, 13, 15, 16, and 18 ha been amended herein without prejudice to include all of the limitations of its respective base claim and any intervening claims. As such, it is respectfully submitted that claims 11, 13 to 16, and 18, are in condition for immediate allowance.

III. Rejection of Claim 10 Under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b)

Claim 10 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 3,449,924 (“Brown”). It is respectfully submitted that Brown does not anticipate claim 10 for at least the following reasons.

Claim 10 relates to a device for adjusting guide blades of a gas turbine, and has been amended to recite, *inter alia*, the features of a generator including a stator and a rotor, wherein the rotor of the generator concentrically surrounds the stator of the torque motor. Support for the amendment may be found, for example, on page 2, lines 23 to 29, of the Specification.

Brown does not disclose, or even suggest, all of the features included in claim 10. Brown discloses a ducted fan engine having vanes that are mounted for rotation in a bearing and a boss, a rod member extending from each vane and having a lever, and a motor controlled by a control means which rotates each vane via the lever. Nowhere does Brown disclose that a rotor of a generator

concentrically surrounds a stator of a torque motor. Therefore, Brown does not disclose, or even suggest, all of the features of claim 10.

In view of all the foregoing, withdrawal of this rejection is respectfully requested.

IV. Rejection of Claim 12 Under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a)

Claim 12 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as unpatentable over the combination of Brown and U.S. Patent No. 6,832,486 (“Care et al.”). It is respectfully submitted that the combination of Brown and Care et al. does not render unpatentable claim 12 for at least the following reasons.

Claim 12 depends from claim 10 and therefore includes all of the features included in claim 10. As more fully set forth above, Brown does not disclose, or even suggest, all of the features of claim 10, from which claim 12 depends. Care et al. is not relied upon for disclosing or suggesting the features of claim 10 not disclosed or suggested by Brown. Indeed, it is respectfully submitted that Care et al. does not disclose, or even suggest, the features included in claim 10 not disclosed or suggested by Brown. As such, it is respectfully submitted that the combination of Brown and Care et al. does not render unpatentable claim 12, which depends from claim 10.

In view of all of the foregoing, withdrawal of this rejection is respectfully requested.

V. Rejection of Claim 17 Under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a)

Claim 17 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as unpatentable over the combination of Brown, Care et al., and U.S. Patent No. 6,873,085 (“Graham et al.”). It is respectfully submitted that the combination of Brown, Care et al., and Graham et al. does not render unpatentable claim 17 for at least the following reasons.

As an initial matter, the Examiner will note that claim 17 has been amended herein without prejudice to correct a grammatical error to add “wherein” between “claim 10,” and “the rotor.”

Claim 17 depends from claim 10 and therefore includes all of the features included in claim 10. As more fully set forth above, Brown and Care et al. do not disclose, or even suggest, all of the features of claim 10. Graham et al. is not

relied upon for disclosing or suggesting the features of claim 10 not disclosed or suggested by Brown and Care et al. Indeed, it is respectfully submitted that Graham et al. does not disclose, or even suggest, the features included in claim 10 not disclosed or suggested by Brown and Care et al. As such, it is respectfully submitted that the combination of Brown, Care et al., and Graham et al. does not render unpatentable claim 17, which depends from claim 10.

In view of all of the foregoing, withdrawal of this rejection is respectfully requested.

VI. Conclusion

It is therefore respectfully submitted that all of the presently pending claims are allowable. All issues raised by the Examiner having been addressed, an early and favorable action on the merits is earnestly solicited.

Respectfully submitted,

Date: August 9, 2010

By: /Clifford A. Ulrich/
Clifford A. Ulrich
Reg. No. 42,194

KENYON & KENYON LLP
One Broadway
New York, New York 10004
(212) 425-7200
CUSTOMER NO. 26646